



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

mu

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/857,524	06/04/2001	Edgar B Cahoon	BB-1264	5260
7590	02/25/2004		EXAMINER	
E I Du Pont De Nemours and Company Legal-Patents Wilmington, DE 19898			RAO, MANJUNATH N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1652	

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/857,524	CAHOON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Manjunath N. Rao, Ph.D.	1652	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 November 2003.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 20-26,29 and 33-39 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 38 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 20-26,29,33-37 and 39 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 20-26, 29, 33-39 are currently pending in this application. Claims 20-26, 29, 33-37, 39 are now under consideration. Claim 38 remains withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to non-elected subject matter.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group I without traverse in Paper filed on 11-24-03 is acknowledged.

Priority

Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged.

Drawings

Drawings submitted in this application are accepted by the Examiner for examination purposes only.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code (for example see page 8). Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 20, 33, 36 and claims 21-26, 34-37 which depend therefrom are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 20, 33, 36 recite the phrase "desaturase polypeptide". The metes and bounds of the phrase specifically the term "desaturase" is not clear to the Examiner. The art recognizes different types of fatty acid desaturases. While the specification indicates that the desaturases of the invention are specifically delta-6-fatty acid desaturase, it is not clear to the Examiner as to what specific activity applicants relate to the claim polypeptide sequences. Correction is required.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 29 is drawn to a cell of claim 28. However, applicants have cancelled claim 28 thereby rendering claim 29 indefinite.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described

in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The instant claim is drawn to a “method of producing γ linolenic acid in soybean plant...”.

Applicant indicates that support for the newly added claim can be found specifically in Example 8. however, a perusal of the specification including example 8 did not provide support for the above method. Therefore, examiner takes the position that said claim constitutes new matter.

Applicants is requested to cancel claim 39 directed to new matter.

Claims 20-26, 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a polynucleotides with SEQ ID NO:1, 3, 5, 7, 16 encoding fatty acid delta-6-desaturase having the amino acid sequence as depicted in SEQ ID NO:2, 4, 6, 8 and 17 and isolated from various sources such as *P.pintandra*, *Zea mays*, *Soybeans* etc. and vectors, host cells and method of making said polypeptide using host cells expressing said polynucleotides, does not reasonably provide enablement for any such polynucleotides encoding amino acid sequences that are 80%, 85%, 90% or 95% identical to SEQ ID NO:2, 4, 6, 8, and 17 and having delta-6-desaturase activity including vectors, host cells and method of making said polypeptides. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required, are summarized in *In re Wands* (858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ 2nd 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988)) as follows: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3)

the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claim(s).

Claims 20-26, 34-37 are so broad as to encompass any polynucleotides encoding amino acid sequences that are 80%, 85%, 90% or 95% identical to SEQ ID NO:2, 4, 6, 8, and 17 and having delta-6-desaturase activity including vectors, host cells and method of making said polypeptides including variants, mutants and recombinants. The scope of the claims is not commensurate with the enablement provided by the disclosure with regard to the extremely large number of desaturases broadly encompassed by the claims. Since the amino acid sequence of a protein determines its structural and functional properties, predictability of which changes can be tolerated in a protein's amino acid sequence and obtain the desired activity requires a knowledge of and guidance with regard to which amino acid/s in the protein's sequence, if any, is/are tolerant of modification and which is/are conserved (i.e. expectedly intolerant to modification), and detailed knowledge of the ways in which the proteins' structure relates to its function. However, in this case the disclosure is limited to the nucleotide and encoded amino acid sequence of only a single enzyme from 5 specific sources. It would require undue experimentation of the skilled artisan to make and use the claimed polynucleotides encoding said polypeptides. The specification is limited to teaching the use of SEQ ID NO:2, 4, 6, 8, and 17 as fatty acid delta-6-desaturase but provides no guidance with regard to the making of variants and mutants or with regard to other uses. In view of the great breadth of the claim, amount of experimentation required to make the claimed polypeptides, the lack of guidance, working examples, and unpredictability of the art in predicting function from a polypeptide primary

structure (e.g., see Ngo et al. in *The Protein Folding Problem and Tertiary Structure Prediction*, 1994, Merz et al. (ed.), Birkhauser, Boston, MA, pp. 433 and 492-495, Ref: U, Form-892), the claimed invention would require undue experimentation. As such, the specification fails to teach one of ordinary skill how to use the full scope of the polypeptides encompassed by this claim.

While recombinant and mutagenesis techniques are known, it is not routine in the art to screen for multiple substitutions or multiple modifications, as encompassed by the instant claims, and the positions within a protein's sequence where amino acid modifications can be made with a reasonable expectation of success in obtaining the desired activity/utility are limited in any protein and the result of such modifications is unpredictable. In addition, one skilled in the art would expect any tolerance to modification for a given protein to diminish with each further and additional modification, e.g. multiple substitutions.

The specification does not support the broad scope of the claims which encompass all modifications and fragments of any polynucleotide encoding any delta-6-desaturase with 80%, 85%, 90%, 95% amino acid sequence identity to the enzymes of SEQ ID NOS:2, 4, 6 and 8 because the specification does not establish: (A) regions of the protein structure which may be modified without affecting said desaturase activity; (B) the general tolerance of said desaturases to modification and extent of such tolerance; (C) a rational and predictable scheme for modifying any amino acid residue with an expectation of obtaining the desired biological function; and (D) the specification provides insufficient guidance as to which of the essentially infinite possible choices is likely to be successful.

Thus, applicants have not provided sufficient guidance to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention in a manner reasonably correlated with the scope

Art Unit: 1652

of the claims broadly including polynucleotides encoding desaturases with an enormous number of amino acid modifications to SEQ ID NOS: 2, 4, 6 and 8. The scope of the claims must bear a reasonable correlation with the scope of enablement (*In re Fisher*, 166 USPQ 19 24 (CCPA 1970)). Without sufficient guidance, determination of polynucleotides having the desired biological characteristics is unpredictable and the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is unnecessarily, and improperly, extensive and undue. See *In re Wands* 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2nd 1400 (Fed. Cir, 1988).

Conclusion

None of the claims are allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manjunath N. Rao, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0939. The examiner can normally be reached on 6.30 a.m. to 3.00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapura Achutamurthy can be reached on 571-272-0939. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4242 for regular communications and 703-308-4242 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 1652

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1234.



MANJUNATH N. RAO
PATENT EXAMINER

Manjunath N. Rao
February 13, 2004